

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-5 and 9-18 are currently amended in the present amendment, claims 6-8, 19 and 20 are canceled and new claims 21-27 are added in the present amendment.

Claims 1-8, 11, 12 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,933,084 to Ravier et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Ravier et al. reference discloses the construction of an indicator light for a motor vehicle. The construction comprises a light source, a reflector, a first screen having lines of optical elements, which converge the light beam received from the reflector on a second screen having alternately arranged colored bands and translucent bands. The optical elements of the first screen preferably consist of convex cylindrical lens elements which are formed on the surface of the first screen. Forming the lenses on the surface of the first screen involves changing the structure of the screen by molding, embossing, or extruding the screen to form the lenses.

In contrast, the present invention involves adding a lenticular lens array to a printed article by printing a plurality of clear, magnifying, convex lenses with clear ink on the surface of the article. In addition, the Ravier et al. reference fails to teach or suggest a graphic image layer including at least one graphic image printed on at least one surface of a substrate. Further, the lenses formed in the Ravier et al. reference are not magnifying lenses, but lenses used to converge light beams received from the reflector on the second screen. Because amended claim 1 includes elements not disclosed in the Ranvier et al. reference, Applicant respectfully requests

that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Applicant contends that claim 1 contains patentable subject matter and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-5 are dependent claims dependent upon independent claim 1, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain. Claims 6-8 are canceled.

Claim 11 recites a lenticular imaging system having a graphic image layer including a plurality of graphic images printed on at least one surface of a substrate and a lenticular lens array printed on the graphic image layer. The Ranvier et al. reference fails to teach or suggest a plurality of graphic images printed on a substrate and a lenticular lens array printed on the graphic image layer. Because amended claim 11 includes elements not disclosed in the Ranvier et al. reference, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Applicant contends that claim 11 contains patentable subject matter and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 12, 16 and 17 are dependent claims dependent upon independent claim 11, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain.

Claim 18 has been amended to emphasize applying at least one graphic image on at least one surface of a substrate and printing a lens array on at least one surface of the substrate above the at least one graphic image. Again, the Ranvier et al. reference fails to teach or suggest applying at least one graphic image on at least one surface of a substrate and printing a lens array

on at least one surface of the substrate above the at least one graphic image. Because claim 18 includes elements not disclosed in the Ranvier et al. reference, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Applicant contends that claim 18 contains patentable subject matter and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 19-20 are canceled.

Claims 1-8, 11, 12 and 16-20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,644,431 to Magee. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Magee reference discloses a partially transparent, directional viewing sheet formed of plastic material with lenticular lenses formed on both the front and back surfaces of the sheet. The lenses are embossed or otherwise formed in the surfaces of the sheet material. Forming the lenses on the surface of the first screen involves changing the structure of the screen by molding, embossing, or extruding the screen to form the lenses. The Magee reference therefore, discloses the lenses being formed in the sheet material using an “embossing or other forming process” (Col. 2, Lines 16-29 and Col. 7, Line 47).

In contrast, the present invention involves adding a lenticular lens array to a printed article by printing a plurality of clear, magnifying, convex lenses with clear ink on the surface of the article. The lenses are printed on the substrate or graphic image layer in the present invention. Because claim 1 includes elements not disclosed in the Magee reference, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Applicant contends that claim 1 contains patentable subject matter and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-5 are dependent claims dependent upon independent claim 1, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain. Claims 6-8 are canceled.

Claim 11 recites a lenticular imaging system having a graphic image layer including a plurality of graphic images printed on at least one surface of a substrate and a lenticular lens array printed on the graphic image layer. The Magee reference fails to teach or suggest a plurality of graphic images printed on a substrate and a lenticular lens array printed on the graphic image layer. Because amended claim 11 includes elements not disclosed in the Magee reference, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Applicant contends that claim 11 contains patentable subject matter and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 12, 16 and 17 are dependent claims dependent upon independent claim 11, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain.

Claim 18 has been amended to emphasize applying at least one graphic image on at least one surface of a substrate and printing a lens array on at least one surface of the substrate above the at least one graphic image. Again, the Magee reference fails to teach or suggest applying at least one graphic image on at least one surface of a substrate and printing a lens array on at least

one surface of the substrate above the at least one graphic image. Because claim 18 includes elements not disclosed in the Magee reference, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Applicant contends that claim 18 contains patentable subject matter and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 19-20 are canceled.

Furthermore, none of the cited prior art references, whether taken singly or in combination with another, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn in light of the amendments and remarks. Therefore, claims 1-24 should now be in condition for allowance.

New claims 21-27 are included to further define the invention and recite elements not in the original set of claims. Claims 21-24 are dependent claims that dependent upon independent claim 1, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain.

New claim 25 recites a lenticular imaging system comprising a substrate having a top surface and a bottom surface; a graphic image layer including a plurality of graphic images printed on at least one surface of the substrate; and a lenticular lens array printed on the graphic image layer, wherein the lenticular lens array comprises a plurality of clear, magnifying, circular convex lenses. Claim 26 recites a printed article comprising a substrate having a top surface and a bottom surface; a graphic image layer including at least one graphic image printed on at least

one surface of the substrate; and a lens array printed on at least one surface of the substrate opposite the graphic image layer, wherein the lens array comprises a plurality of clear, magnifying convex lenses. Claim 27 recites a printed article comprising a substrate having a top surface and a bottom surface; a graphic image layer including at least one graphic image printed on at least one surface of the substrate; a transparent layer applied to the graphic image layer; and a lens array printed on the transparent layer, wherein the lens array comprises a plurality of clear, magnifying convex lenses. None of the cited prior art references teach or suggest a lens array printed on the surface of the substrate or a layer of another material.

Applicant believes that new claims 21-27 contain patentable subject matter and are in condition for allowance.

In view of the amendments and remarks presented above, the Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims. No new matter has been added to the application. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned in the event a telephone conference would be helpful in advancing prosecution of the application.

Application No. 10/091,923
Amendment dated October 2, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed May 23, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.

Dated: 10/02/2003

By: William K. Baxter
William K. Baxter
Reg. No. 41,606

Attorneys of Record for Applicant
GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3590
Telephone: 414-273-3500
Facsimile: 414-273-5198
Email: wbaxter@gklaw.com

MW743632_1.DOC